

REMARKS

The Examiner's comments together with the cited references have been carefully studied. Favorable reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 have been rejected. Claims 8 and 9 have been objected to. Claims 10-20 have been allowed. Claim 8 has been canceled. Claims 1, 10, and 17 herewith are amended. Claims 1 to 7 and 9 to 20 are presently pending. Favorable reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 8 and 9 and the allowance of claims 10 to 20.

Claims 1-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Eikenberry et al. It is the conclusion of the Examiner that "It would at least be obvious to one skilled in the art to use amounts of gold and sulfur sensitizers in Eikenberry toward the lower end of their most preferred ranges."

This rejection is now believed moot in view of the incorporation of the limitation of claim 8 into claim 1. Eikenberry et al. do not disclose a photothermographic system, nor the use of organic silver donors, which requires heat for development. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to require that, in the emulsion used in the imaging layer of the present invention, the silver as silver halide relative to total silver, including both silver halide and organic silver donor, is present in said emulsion in an amount from 30 to 85% by weight. Support for this amendment is to be found in original dependent claim 8.

In view thereof, it follows that the subject matter of the claims would not have been obvious in view of Eikenberry et al. at the time the invention was made.

Applicants have reviewed the prior art made of record and believe that singly or in any suitable combination, they do not render Applicants' claimed invention unpatentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendment, the claims are now believed allowable and such favorable action is courteously solicited.

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

Respectfully submitted,



Chris P. Konkol
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 34,117

CPK:clb
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 722-0452
Facsimile: (585) 477-1148